

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 26-53 were pending in the application, of which Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 are independent. In the Office Action dated September 18, 2006, Claims 26-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 26-32, 34-36, and 38-53 remain in this application with Claims 33 and 37 being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. **Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

In the Office Action dated September 18, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 26-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 33 and 37 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

II. **Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 26-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Adobe® FrameMaker®+SGML integrated XML authoring and composition tool as disclosed by "Adobe® FrameMaker®+SGML 5.5: Developing SGML Publishing Applications," 1997 (hereinafter "AFM97") and Charles F.

Goldfarb and Paul Prescod, "The XML Handbooks," 1998 (hereinafter "*Goldfarb and Prescod*"), pp. 278-295, in view of Elliotte Rusty Harold, "XML Bible," 1999, IDG Books Worldwide, Inc. (art of record; hereinafter "*Harold*"). Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 26 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "wherein the acceptable attribute value not being obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag comprises the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag causing overlapping controls." Amended Claims 34, 38, 42, and 43 each includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 17, line 3 through page 18, line 14.

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *AFM97* and *Goldfarb* at least do not teach or suggest a plurality of resource tag attribute default value mechanisms whose order corresponds to a precedence order of default values for the attributes. (See Office Action page 5, line 20 through page 6, line 2.) Accordingly, Applicants submit that because *AFM97* and *Goldfarb* do not suggest or disclose a precedence order of default values for the attributes, these references do not suggest or disclose the precedence order of default values comprising first using an attribute value associated with a previous occurrence of a tag in a tree if the tag is not provided with an overriding attribute, then using a default attribute value if no previous occurrence of the tag is present in the tree. Consequently, *AFM97* and *Goldfarb* at least does not teach or suggest if an acceptable attribute value is not obtained by the attribute value associated

with the previous occurrence of the tag in the tree or the default attribute value, then using an attribute provided by one of the application or the user. Furthermore, because AFM97 and *Goldfarb* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned acceptable attribute, these references cannot teach or suggest the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag comprises the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag causing overlapping controls.

Furthermore, *Harold* does not overcome AFM97's and *Goldfarb*'s deficiencies. *Harold* merely discloses, if there is not a rule that specifies a font size of an element, then the element inherits the font size of its parent. (See *Harold*, page 334, lines 5-6.) One way to avoid problems created by this inheritance while retaining some control over the size of individual elements is to use relative units like "ems" and "ex's" instead of absolute units like points, picas, inches, centimeters, and millimeters. (See *Harold*, page 335, lines 5-7.) An "em" is the width of the letter *m* in the current font. (See *Harold*, page 335, lines 7-8.) An "ex" is the height of the letter *x* in the current font. (See *Harold*, page 335, 8-9.) If the font gets bigger, so does everything measured in "ems" and "ex's." (See *Harold*, page 335, line 9.) Furthermore, *Harold* discloses that a similar option for some properties is to use percentage units. (See *Harold*, page 335, line 9.)

Moreover, *Harold* discloses that if no value is inherited from a parent element, a default value is used. (See *Harold*, page 337, lines 13-14.) Like AFM97 and *Goldfarb*, *Harold* at least does not teach or suggest first using an attribute value associated with a previous occurrence of a tag in a tree, if the tag is not provided with an overriding attribute, and then using a default attribute value if no previous occurrence of the tag is

present in the tree. Furthermore, *Harold* at least does not teach or suggest if an acceptable attribute value is not obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag in the tree or the default attribute value, then using an attribute provided by one of the application or the user. Rather, *Harold* merely discloses using relative units instead of absolute units or using percentage units and if there is no value is inherited from a parent element, a default value is used. Consequently, because *Harold* does not teach or suggest the aforementioned acceptable attribute, *Harold* cannot teach or suggest the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag comprises the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag causing overlapping controls.

Combining *AFM97*, *Goldfarb*, and *Harold* would not have led to the claimed invention because *AFM97*, *Goldfarb*, and *Harold*, either individually or in any reasonable combination, at least do not disclose or suggest “wherein the acceptable attribute value not being obtained by the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag comprises the attribute value associated with the previous occurrence of the tag causing overlapping controls,” as recited by amended Claim 26. Amended Claims 34, 38, 42, and 43 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43 each patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 26, 34, 38, 42, and 43.

Dependent Claims 27-32, 35-36, 39-41, and 44-53 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 26, 34, 38, and 43, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 26, 34, 38, and 43.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 27-32, 35-36, 39-41, and 44-53.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,  
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
404.954.5066

Date: November 27, 2006

DKS:mdc



D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE